



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,553	01/04/2001	David A. Cobbley	INTL-0526-US (P10830)	3695

7590

09/03/2003

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

VU, THANH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/754,553

Applicant(s)

COBBLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh T. Vu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being anticipated by Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,947) in view of Vale (U.S. Pat. No. 6,359,572).

Per claim 1, Kanevsky teaches a method comprising: moving a data entry area on a user interface (figs. 7 and 10; col. 1, lines 57-65; the examiner infer data entry as a selectable item on the web page), but does not teach displaying a keyboard image on the user interface. However, Vale teaches a method of displaying a keyboard image on a user interface (figs 5-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Vale in the invention of Kanevsky in order to provide the users of handheld devices a way to eliminate the full size physical keyboard and provides representation of a keyboard touch-sensitive display.

Per claim 2, Vale teaches the method of claim 1 including moving a data entry area on said interface to enable an unobstructed view of said keyboard image and said data entry areas (fig. 7, col. 7, lines 49-61; col. 8, lines 9-12).

Per claim 3, Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 1 including searching for coding associated with data entry areas to identify the location of a data entry area (col. 9, lines 46-62).

Art Unit: 2174

Per claim 4, Kanewsky teaches the method of claim 3 including searching for characteristic coding of a web page (col. 9, lines 46-62).

Per claim 5, the method of claim 1 including moving data from the location where a keyboard image is to be positioned and positioning said data at another location on said interface (col. 10, lines 46-51).

Claims 7-11 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-5 respectively.

Claims 13-17 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-5 respectively.

Per claim 18, Vale teaches the system of claim 13 further including a touch-screen coupled to the processor (col. 3, lines 10-15).

Per claim 19, Kanewsky teaches the system of claim 13 wherein said storage stores instructions to determine whether the image will obscure the data entry area and, if so, to move the data entry area (col. 9, lines 35-45; col. 10, lines 45-51).

Claims 6, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,947) in view of Vale (U.S. Pat. No. 6,359,572) and further in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,424,359).

Per claim 6, Kanevsky and Vale teaches the method of claim 1, but does not teaches the method including scrolling the data entry area to prevent the data entry area from being obscured by the keyboard image. However, Kobayshi teaches the method including scrolling the data entry area to prevent the data entry area from being obscured by the keyboard image (fig. 7A-7D; col. 1, lines 40-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Kobayshi in the invention of

Art Unit: 2174

Kanevsky and Vale in order users to scroll the screen effectively to display content that are not fully displayed within a window.

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

Claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cobbley et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,501,464) discloses an on screen transparent keyboard interface.

Miller (U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,440) discloses a computer interface module having flat menu.

Bertram et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,828,451) discloses a computer programmed soft keyboard system, method and apparatus having user input displacement.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (703)-308-9119. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/754,553
Art Unit: 2174

Page 5

T. Vu

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100